

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,808,224 to Kato in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,328,272 to Kuramochi et al. (hereinafter, “Kuramochi”).

Regarding the §112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 1-8, the Examiner states, “From the specification, it appears that the RF receiving unit and the extension pack are the same elements. However, claims 1 and 5 disclose that the RF receiving pack comprise the extension pack. It is not clear whether these two elements are separate features.” (Office Action, page 2).

The Specification of the present application states, “FIG. 3 is a block diagram of the serial communication driver used as the RF Karaoke data receiving pack of the Karaoke system of FIG. 1...the serial communication driver includes...an extension pack 280.” (Specification, paragraph [0028]). In other words, the Specification of the present application explicitly states that the extension pack is an element included within the serial communication driver, which is used in the RF Karaoke data receiving pack. Therefore, Claims 1 and 5 are consistent with the Specification of the present application. Therefore, Claims 1-8 satisfy the requirements of §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph, rejection of Claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of independent Claim 1, which recite, an audio/key data separator for separating the voice signal and key data signal from the

signal demodulated by the demodulator,” these claims are patentable over Kato and Kuramochi. Regarding this limitation, the Examiner merely states, “Kato discloses...an audio/key data separator (e.g., digital information extractor) (See fig. 1)....” (Office Action, page 2). However, FIG. 1 of Kato, which is cited by the Examiner, does not include a digital information extractor. Further, regarding the digital information extractor, Kato merely states, “a digital information extractor 125 for extracting received information from the transmitter/receiver 122,” and “a digital information extractor 113 for extracting the information received from the carrier radio wave.” (Kato, column 11, line 66- column 12, line 12; FIG. 8). Kato does not include any reference to separating a voice signal and a key data signal. Therefore, Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-quoted limitation of Claim 1.

Kuramochi does not cure the deficiencies of Kato. All of the claimed features of independent Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Kato and Kuramochi or by either reference alone. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Kato and Kuramochi. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding §103(a) rejection of independent Claim 6, which recites, “a wireless microphone device for...radio- transmitting the modulated key data signal and voice signal,” this claim is patentable over Kato and Kuramochi. The Examiner states that Kato discloses, “a portable downloader connectable to a karaoke player comprising an RF receiver for receiving a voice signal and a key data signal transmitted from a wireless microphone (See claim 3) via a receiving antenna....” (Office Action, page 2).

However, although the Examiner cites Claim 3 of Kato, the claims of Kato do not include any reference to a microphone or, more specifically, a wireless microphone. More specifically, Claim 3 of Kato merely states, “a bi-directional wireless

communication channel formed between the player and the loader for exchanging a control message effective to control the downloading of the data of the songs.” The communications of Claim 3 of Kato do not originate from a wireless microphone. Further, Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest that this wireless communication channel is for sending both a voice signal and a key data signal. To the contrary, FIG. 3 of Kato depicts a *wired* microphone 25 connected to a karaoke player 1, which teaches away from the limitations of Claim 6. Therefore, Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-quoted limitation of Claim 6.

Kuramochi does not cure the deficiencies of Kato. All of the claimed features of independent Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Kato and Kuramochi or by either reference alone. Therefore, Claim 6 is patentable over Kato and Kuramochi. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of Claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 7-8 are dependent claims, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above with regard to their respective independent Claims 1 and 6.

Attorney Docket No: 1387-2 (PX2141-US)

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Owens, III

Reg. No. 51,314

Attorney for Applicant

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP**  
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E  
Melville, New York 11747  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475